



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/470,481

12/22/1999

ZHIMEI JIANG

1999-0162

6201

84021 7590 01/19/2010
AT & T LEGAL DEPARTMENT - Wilde
ATTN: PATENT DOCKETING
ROOM 2A-207
ONE AT & T WAY
BEDMINISTER, NJ 07921

EXAMINER

CORBO, NICHOLAS T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2427

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/19/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/470,481	Applicant(s) JIANG ET AL.	
	Examiner NICHOLAS T. CORBO	Art Unit 2427	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2,9,11,12 and 19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2,9,11,12 and 19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2, 9, 11-12, and 19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Double Patenting

2. A rejection based on double patenting of the "same invention" type finds its support in the language of 35 U.S.C. 101 which states that "whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process ... may obtain a patent therefor ..." (Emphasis added). Thus, the term "same invention," in this context, means an invention drawn to identical subject matter. See *Miller v. Eagle Mfg. Co.*, 151 U.S. 186 (1894); *In re Ockert*, 245 F.2d 467, 114 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1957); and *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970).

A statutory type (35 U.S.C. 101) double patenting rejection can be overcome by canceling or amending the conflicting claims so they are no longer coextensive in scope. The filing of a terminal disclaimer cannot overcome a double patenting rejection based upon 35 U.S.C. 101.

3. Claims 2, 9, 11-12, and 19 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 2, 9, 11-12, and 19 of copending

Application No. 12/316,213. This is a provisional double patenting rejection since the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

4. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422

F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

5. Claims 9 and 19 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 8, respectively, of U.S. Patent No. 7,464,395 in view of Gleeson et al (hereinafter referred to as Gleeson) US Patent No. 5,446,736.

Referring to claims 9 and 19, the instant application does not disclose the use of a wireless network or channels for packet transmission as seen in claims 1 and 8, respectively, of US 7464395.

Gleeson discloses the use of wireless network/channels for packet transmission **(see Fig. 16 and Col. 17, Lines 28-32)**.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the wireless network of Gleeson with the system of the instant application in order to connect devices together which are located at distances that are typically larger than the distances spanned by LANs (local area networks) **(see Gleeson, Col. 1, Lines 32-34)**.

Claim Objections

6. Claims 2, 9, and 19 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Referring to claim 2, lines 16-17 recite, "...the previously skipped packet." The limitation of previously skipped packet possesses no antecedent in claim 2. In order to expedite the prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner recommends changing the limitation to read, "the previously skipped lower priority packet." Appropriate correction is required.

Referring to claim 9, lines 10-15 recite, "...wherein, the step of selectively transmitting is performed by calculating a probability of higher priority packets being delivered prior to play-out times for the higher priority packets is performed by estimating the success probability...." The limitations as amended suffer from poor grammar. In order to expedite the prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner recommends changing the limitations to read, "...wherein, the step of selectively transmitting is performed by calculating a probability of higher priority packets being delivered prior to play-out times for the higher priority packets, which is performed by estimating the success probability...."

Referring to claim 19, line 13 recites, "...the previously skipped packet." The limitation of previously skipped packet possesses no antecedent in claim 19. In order to expedite the prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner recommends changing the limitation to read, "the previously skipped non-transmitted packet." Appropriate correction is required.

Allowable Subject Matter

Art Unit: 2427

7. Claims 2, 9, 11-12, and 19 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the double patenting rejection(s) and claim objections, set forth in this Office action.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NICHOLAS CORBO whose telephone number is (571)270-5675. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 900am-530pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Scott Beliveau can be reached on (571)272-7343. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

N.T.C.

01/06/2010

Application/Control Number: 09/470,481

Page 6

Art Unit: 2427

Examiner, Art Unit 2427

/Scott Beliveau/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2427